

REMARKS

In the present restriction requirement the examiner requested restriction to what he believes three different inventions:

I. Claims 1-6, drawn to a system for detecting electrical arcs;

II. Claims 7-10, drawn to a method for detecting electrical arcs by detecting past, present and future cycles of power; and

III. Claims 11-16, drawn to a system for detecting electrical arcs including causal/non-causal logic.

Applicant respectfully points out that claims 1-6 are not drawn to a system as identified by the examiner, but are instead drawn to method. Claims 1-6 are drawn to a method for detecting arcing conditions, and 7-10 are drawn to a method for detecting electrical arcs. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that claims 1-10 be examined as similar method claims. If the examiner does not agree that claims 1-10 should be examined, applicant elects claim 1-6 for further prosecution.

Applicants respectfully requests that a timely notice of allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/821,703
Amdt. Dated May 30, 2006
Response to Restriction Req. of November 29, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



May 30, 2006

Jaye G. Heybl
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,661

Koppel, Patrick, & Heybl
555 St. Charles Drive, Suite 107
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360
Phone 805 373 0060
Fax 805 373 0051